

Appl. No. 10/590,921  
Amdt. Dated 23 July 2009  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2009

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 6a, 6b and 18. These replacement sheets replace the originally filed sheets 6/18 and 18/18.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

## REMARKS

The outstanding Office Action: (1) rejects claim 19 based on a lack of antecedent basis; rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10-17, 22, 23, and 26-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,619,835 ("Kita") or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Kita alone or taken in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,890 ("Kim") and U.S. Patent No. 6,549,791 ("Jeon") and U.S. Patent No. 4,586,827 ("Hirsch"); and (2) rejects claims 3, 7, 9, 28, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,775,205 ("Sporn") and U.S. Patent No. 4,873,677 ("Sakamoto"). The Office Action states that claims 18, 20, 21, 24, and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims.

### Clarity Objections

As shown in the amended claims, claim 19 has been amended to specifically recite the "docking point circuit boards." Claim 1 has been amended to refer to "the circuitry, the docking points and the attached modules" as suggested by the Office Action.

Reference numeral 51 has been added to Figure 6a for the locking bar. Reference numeral 51a has been added to Figures 6a, 6b and 18 to show the member that springs the locking bar 51. Reference numeral 67 has been added to Figures 6b and 18 for the vertical prong. Figure 6b has been amended for consistency with Figure 18 by showing the "space for movement" to the right of the locking bar 51. Replacement drawing sheets are attached.

### Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended to draw out the distinctions of that claim over the prior art by specifying more closely what is meant by "clasp" and "connector." In particular, claim 1 has been amended to require "*a clasp to allow a person to manually close and fasten the overall device as a loop such that it can be worn on the person*" and "*a connector embedded within the clasp which is made accessible when the clasp is opened for allowing at least one of a power and data connection to be made to the device from an external computing device*".

Also, present claim 1 incorporates some of the features from original claim 20 to further distance the invention of claim 1 from the cited prior art. In particular, claim 1 has been

Appl. No. 10/590,921  
Amdt. Dated 23 July 2009  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2009

amended to require “*wherein the clasp has a male component comprising said connector and a female component arranged to attach to the male component and encase the connector when the clasp is closed.*”

Similar amendments have been made to claim 33 as made to claim 1. Claim 20 has been amended for consistency with amended claim 1.

Referring to *Kita*, as shown for example by Figure 1A, *Kita* teaches a watch comprising a watch body 6 attached at each side to a strap 4,5. Each strap 4,5 has modules attached to it and has connectors 41,51 extending along the inside of the strap which connect the modules to the watch body 6. As can be seen, the clasp of the watch is entirely conventional, consisting of a buckle 2,11 at the end of one strap for engaging with holes provided in the other strap. Clearly this clasp does not have a connector. Thus, given a normal reading, the "clasp" (in the sense of present claim 1) of *Kita* does not have a connector, as required by present claim 1.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action argues that Figure 15A of *Kita* shows a clasp with a connector embedded in the clasp. Figure 15A shows how the straps 4,5 are attached to the watch body 6 via a pin 67 and spring contacts 70 in the watch body 6 which make contact with the connectors 41,51 in the straps 4,5. The Office Action equates the clasp and connector of present claim 1 with this arrangement for attaching the strap to the watch body of *Kita*. However, this arrangement is clearly not a "clasp" in the sense of present claim 1, i.e. a means by which the user fastens the strap about his/her wrist. To draw out this distinction, claim 1 has been amended as described above to specify that the clasp "allows a person to manually close and fasten the device" and "a connector embedded within the clasp which is made accessible when the clasp is opened for allowing at least one of a power and data connection to be made to the device from an external device". *Kita* clearly does not teach or suggest such an arrangement.

Turning to *Hirsch*, this reference does not teach a clasp with a connector embedded in the clasp either. *Hirsch* discloses a wriststrap in the form of a "ribbon cable" having a plurality of insulated, conducting wires extending along its length. Modules can be positioned on the strap and communicate with each other via the conducting wires. The only mention of the means by which the strap is opened/closed in *Hirsch* is at column 5, lines 53 to 54, where it is stated that the user can attach the section 16a of the bracelet 16 to the outside of the free end 16b of the bracelet by means of a clamping closure. Although not shown clearly by any of the drawings,

Appl. No. 10/590,921  
Amdt. Dated 23 July 2009  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2009

this clamping closure of *Hirsch* seems to be entirely conventional. Certainly, there is no disclosure of the clamping closure having a connector. Indeed, *Hirsch* does not appear to teach any connector for connecting the strap to an external device.

The Office Action suggests in paragraph 4 that module 12 shown in Figure 2 of *Hirsch* constitutes a clasp and connector as required by present claim 1. However, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Office Action is incorrect and is misinterpreting what is being shown by Figure 2. Figure 2 shows the way in which a module is positioned on and makes electrical contact with the strap. The strap is first threaded through an aperture in the module until the module is positioned at the desired location on the strap. The lid 34 of the module is then closed so that sharp connecting pins 32 on the underside of the lid pierce the insulation of the wires and makes electrical contact with the wires. Thus, the module 12 is not a clasp for to allow a person to manually close and fasten the overall device as a loop such that it can be worn on the person as required by present claim 1. Nor does module 12 have a connector embedded within the clasp which is made accessible when the clasp is opened for allowing at least one of a power and data connection to be made to the device from an external device, as required by present claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to require the clasp has a male component comprising said connector and a female component arranged to attach to the male component and encase the connector when the clasp is closed. This is not taught or suggested by any of the cited prior art.

Thus, neither *Kita* nor *Hirsch* teaches or suggests the clasp and connector arrangement of present claim 1, nor the advantages achieved by this arrangement. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully suggest that claim 1 and all claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable.

Claim 33 has similar distinctions over the prior art as claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is

Appl. No. 10/590,921  
Amdt. Dated 23 July 2009  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2009

respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Conley Rose, P.C. Deposit Account Number 03-2769 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Pierce/  
Jonathan Pierce  
PTO Reg. No. 42,073  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
P.O. Box 3267  
Houston, TX 77253-3267  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
*ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT*

301779.01